

Evidence-Based Decision Making Research Matrix Findings – by Decision Point
10-26-15

Arrest decisions (cite, detain, divert, treat, release)

Police officer's conscientiousness in treating criminal suspects in a procedurally fair manner may have crime reducing effects.

Primary Citation: Paternoster, Bachman, Brame, & Sherman (1997)

Consistent with research indicating that criminal justice contact can increase offending risk (e.g., Loughran et al., 2009), both caution and intervention diversion programs were more effective in reducing general recidivism compared to the more restrictive traditional forms of criminal justice processing (i.e., incarceration and probation).

Primary Citation: Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Low risk youths are more likely to benefit from caution programs, while moderate to high risk youths are more likely to benefit from intervention programs (namely, CBT-based interventions).

Primary Citation: Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Pre-booking diversion options for adult offenders with serious mental illness is associated with fiscal savings.

Primary Citation: Cowell, Hinde, Broner, & Aldridge (2013)

The introduction of objective actuarial risk assessment tools (e.g., ODARA) into police decision-making tasks can support the identification of higher risk individuals.

Primary Citation: Hilton, Harris, & Rice (2007)

Pretrial status decisions (release on recognizance, release on financial bond, release with supervision conditions, detain, violation response, supervision conditions reassessment)

Providing judicial officers with objective information about defendants' backgrounds and community ties (as well as about the charges against the defendant) coupled with the use of a validated instrument helps produce more equitable and effective pretrial decisions.

Primary Citation: Goldkamp & Gottfredson (1985)

Use of standardized risk assessment tools is recommended at the pretrial stage to appropriately gauge a defendant's risk level and to subsequently guide release decisions. Use of structured protocols serves to minimize the decision maker's biases, appropriately place offenders based on their actual level of risk, and improve the allocation of scarce criminal justice resources.

Primary Citation: Cadigan & Lowenkamp (2011a)

There is an acute need to accurately assess the risk level of defendants since making pretrial release and detention decisions without actuarial assessment guidance can have deleterious effects on both defendants and the general public. For example, releasing extremely high risk defendants without assessment or matched supervision can be a threat to public safety, while detaining low and moderate risk defendants in jail for even short periods of time (i.e., 2–3 days) can increase their risk for misconduct both short- and long-term.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, VanNostrand, & Holsinger (2013a)

Identifying and addressing gender-responsive needs at the pretrial stage via structured assessments and interventions may contribute to more successful outcomes for women.

Primary Citation: Gehring & Van Voorhis (2014)

All other things being equal, defendants detained pretrial are more likely to be convicted and to receive longer sentences than defendants who are not detained.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, VanNostrand, & Holsinger (2013b)

Defendants released at the pretrial stage experience more desirable outcomes at later stages of criminal justice processing (i.e., lower recidivism rates) compared with those who are detained in custody.

Primary Citation: Cadigan & Lowenkamp (2011b)

While the research suggests that pretrial supervision can help achieve better court appearance or public safety rates, the research concerning the efficacy of *particular* variations of general supervision or *particular* techniques reflecting specific conditions or interventions (such as drug testing or electronic monitoring) is often limited, inconclusive, or has shown no effect on pretrial misbehavior.

Primary Citations: Lowenkamp & VanNostrand (2013); VanNostrand, Rose, & Weibrecht (2011)

Court date notification significantly increases court appearance rates.

Primary Citation: Schnacke, Jones, & Wilderman (2012)

Diversion and deferred prosecution decisions

Services and more intensive supervision are most effective when directed to higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court has the potential to aggravate short-term recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner (1996)

The use of prison does not appear to produce a specific deterrence effect.

Primary Citation: Jonson (2011)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Low risk youths are more likely to benefit from caution programs, while moderate to high risk youths are more likely to benefit from intervention programs (namely, CBT-based interventions).

Primary Citation: Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Pre-booking diversion options for adult offenders with serious mental illness is associated with fiscal savings.

Primary Citation: Cowell, Hinde, Broner, & Aldridge (2013)

Diversion of non-violent drug offenders into substance abuse treatment as opposed to incarceration produces long-term cost savings.

Primary Citation: Anglin, Nosyk, Jaffe, Urada, & Evans (2013)

The net economic benefit per drug court participant can range from \$3,000 to \$13,000.

Primary Citation: Carey, Finigan, Crumpton, & Waller (2006)

Drug courts should consider adopting a pre-plea or post-plea model, providing offenders with incentives for completion, and using cognitive behavioral techniques.

Primary Citation: Wilson, Mitchell, & MacKenzie (2006)

Drug court processing results in superior outcomes over traditional justice system processing for drug-involved individuals. Specifically, drug courts have been shown to reduce recidivism by an average of 8 to 26%, with the most effective drug courts achieving crime reduction results of 35 to 40%.

Primary Citations: Lowenkamp, Holsinger, & Latessa (2005); Shaffer (2006)

A review of 50 studies of 55 drug courts found that the recidivism rate (for both drug and non-drug offenses) was lower on average for drug court participants than for those in the comparison group (38% compared to 50%).

Primary Citation: Mitchell, Wilson, Eggers, & MacKenzie (2012)

Restorative justice options yield greater completion of restitution agreements, and satisfactions among victims and justice-involved individuals than non-restorative processing.

Primary Citation: Latimer, Dowden, & Muise (2001)

While restorative justice programs have yielded recidivism-reducing effects, their impact is not as pronounced as that of the psychologically informed targeting of criminogenic needs such as procriminal attitudes, antisocial peers, and substance abuse. Ideally, restorative justice and evidence-based programming for justice-involved individuals should be viewed as complementary approaches.

Primary Citation: Latimer, Dowden, & Muise (2001, 2005)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

The success of diversion programs is contingent on quality of program design and implementation. Diversion programs that include family-based interventions and demonstrate a high level of fidelity monitoring are especially promising insofar as reducing recidivism rates among juvenile offenders.

Primary Citation: Schwalbe, Gearing, MacKenzie, Brewer, & Ibrahim (2012)

Mental health courts (diversion programs) linked to a range of community resources are a promising avenue for the processing of offenders battling mental illness.

Primary Citation: Case, Steadman, Dupuis, & Morris (2009)

The application of structured assessment tools such as the HCR-20 and PCL:SV could potentially be used to assess mentally ill offender's diversion eligibility, thereby reducing the number of non-compliances and re-incarcerations.

Primary Citation: Barber-Rioja, Dewey, Kopelovich, & Kucharski (2012)

Charging decisions (charge, dismiss)

Low risk youth are more likely to benefit from caution programs, while moderate to high risk youth are more likely to benefit from intervention programs (namely, CBT-based interventions).

Primary Citation: Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court has the potential to aggravate short-term recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner (1996)

Pre-booking diversion options for adult offenders with serious mental illness is associated with fiscal savings.

Primary Citation: Cowell, Hinde, Broner, & Aldridge (2013)

Consistent with research indicating that criminal justice contact can increase offending risk (e.g., Loughran et al., 2009), both caution and intervention diversion programs have been shown to be more effective in reducing general recidivism compared to the more restrictive traditional forms of criminal justice processing (i.e., incarceration and probation).

Primary Citations: Loughran, Mulvey, Schubert, Fagan, Piquero, & Losoya (2009); Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Plea decisions (plea terms)

Lengthier sentences do not have an appreciable effect on recidivism.

Primary Citation: Meade, Steiner, Makarios, & Travis (2012)

The use of prison does not appear to produce a specific deterrence effect.

Primary Citation: Jonson (2011)

Offenders sentenced to a term of imprisonment were significantly more likely to recidivate than those referred to a community-based diversion program.

Primary Citation: Bales & Piquero (2012)

Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism. More severe sanctions (i.e., longer prison sentences) may increase recidivism.

Primary Citations: Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002); Gendreau & Goggin (1996)

Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves.

Primary Citation: Petersilia & Turner (1993)

Transfer of juveniles to adult criminal court has the potential to aggravate short-term recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Bishop, Frazier, Lanza-Kaduce, & Winner (1996)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

Low risk youths are more likely to benefit from caution programs, while moderate to high risk youths are more likely to benefit from intervention programs (namely, CBT-based interventions).

Primary Citation: Wilson & Hoge (2013)

Pre-booking diversion options for adult offenders with serious mental illness is associated with fiscal savings.

Primary Citation: Cowell, Hinde, Broner, & Aldridge (2013)

Diversion of non-violent drug offenders into substance abuse treatment as opposed to incarceration produces long-term cost savings.

Primary Citation: Anglin, Nosyk, Jaffe, Urada, & Evans (2013)

The risk principle holds in drug court settings; drug court is most effective with high risk individuals.

Primary Citation: Marlowe, Festinger, Lee, Dugosh, & Benasutti (2006)

Sentencing decisions (sentence type, length, terms and conditions)

The use of prison does not appear to produce a specific deterrence effect.

Primary Citation: Jonson (2011)

Longer sentences do not have an appreciable effect on recidivism.

Primary Citation: Meade, Steiner, Makarios, & Travis (2012)

Offenders sentenced to a term of imprisonment were significantly more likely to recidivate than those referred to a community-based diversion program.

Primary Citation: Bales & Piquero (2012)

Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism. More severe sanctions (i.e., longer prison sentences) may increase recidivism.

Primary Citations: Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002); Gendreau & Goggin (1996)

Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves.

Primary Citation: Petersilia & Turner (1993)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

The majority of services and more intensive supervision should be directed to higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Research supports correctional agencies' adoption of operant behavioral techniques in the management of offenders on community supervision. Specifically, rewards should exceed sanctions in a ratio of 4:1.

Primary Citation: Wodahl, Garland, Culhane, & McCarty (2011)

Correctional interventions that are grounded in the principles of risk/need/responsivity produce recidivism reductions in the most cost-effective manner.

Primary Citation: Romani, Morgan, Gross, & McDonald (2012)

Both maintaining a high level of treatment integrity and adhering to a human service treatment philosophy increase program effectiveness. It is recommended that agencies implement periodic assessments such as the CPAI so as to ensure continued program integrity.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa (2010)

Even among first-time violent offenders, the most effective (and economical) sentencing alternative lies in the least restrictive option (i.e., community supervision).

Primary Citation: Ryan, Abrams, & Huang (2014)

Grounded in principles of restorative justice, reparative probation (as implemented in Vermont) is a more effective alternative to standard probation with respect to lowering recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Humphrey, Burford, & Dye (2012)

Local and state institutional intervention decisions (security level, behavior change interventions)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

A single one-size-fits-all approach to risk assessment may not be appropriate across all levels of criminal justice processing. For example, dynamic factors that are important for community adjustment (e.g., substance abuse) may not be as important to predicting misconduct in custodial settings. Ultimately, jurisdiction-specific validation of risk assessment tools vis-à-vis the various outcomes of interest is highly recommended.

Primary Citation: Makarios & Latessa (2013)

Higher levels of security within institutions can exert criminogenic effects. Prison administrators might experiment with classification thresholds to ensure the least restrictive conditions possible given one's level of risk.

Primary Citation: Gaes & Camp (2009)

Boot camps (especially juvenile boot camps) are of doubtful efficacy.

Primary Citation: MacKenzie, Wilson, & Kider (2001)

Enhanced prison management will result through a strategy in which programming has a central role.

Primary Citation: French & Gendreau (2006)

Correctional interventions that are grounded in the principles of risk/need/responsivity produce recidivism reductions in the most cost-effective manner.

Primary Citation: Romani, Morgan, Gross, & McDonald (2012)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Cognitive behavioral programs applied across both institutional and community settings – namely, Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) – effectively reduce recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Tong & Farrington (2006)

The majority of services and more intensive supervision should be directed to higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders.

Primary Citation: Dowden & Andrews (2004)

Research indicates a relationship between the integrity with which a correctional program is implemented and recidivism outcomes.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Programs that are poorly designed and implemented (i.e., those that do not adhere to basic principles of effective correctional intervention) are apt to increase recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Wilson & Davis (2006)

Both maintaining a high level of treatment integrity and adhering to a human service treatment philosophy increase program effectiveness. It is recommended that agencies implement periodic assessments such as the CPAI so as to ensure continued program integrity.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa (2010)

Local and state institutional release/parole release decisions (timing of release, conditions of release)

Direct release from high security, segregated supermax settings to the community is associated with increases in recidivism rates and shorter time to reoffending.

Primary Citation: Lovell, Johnson, & Cain (2007)

Empirical evidence suggests that institutional misconduct is predictive of future criminal outcomes in the community. It is therefore appropriate for parole boards to incorporate this information into their decision-making process.

Primary Citation: Mooney & Daffern (2011)

Mental illness per se does not tend to predict recidivism among parolees.

Primary Citations: Matejkowski, Draine, Solomon, & Salzer (2011); Walters & Crawford (2014)

Halfway house interventions with supervision geared to level of risk/need can be effective with higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Andrews & Janes (2006)

A sample of non-violent inmates in Kentucky who had their sentences commuted posed no greater threat to public safety than those who remained incarcerated until their sentence expiration date. Moreover, by releasing the commuted sentence group, the research team estimated a cost savings of \$13,430,834.

Primary Citation: Vito, Tewksbury, & Higgins (2010)

Local and state reentry planning decisions

The Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiatives (SVORI) [a comprehensive program designed to prepare high risk offenders for successful community reintegration through both institutional and community-based programming] successfully reduced likelihood of recidivism in contrast to traditional parole services and supervision.

Primary Citation: Bouffard & Bergeron (2006)

Well-designed and implemented reentry programs (such as Minnesota Comprehensive Offender Reentry Plan (MCORP) which underscores a collaborative relationship between institutional caseworkers and community supervision agents) can effectively reduce recidivism rates and yield a positive return on investment.

Primary Citation: Duwe (2014)

Particularly in the absence of community supervision, reentry programs (such as Project Re-Connect in St. Louis, MO) that address multiple service needs and link offenders to important services (e.g., housing, education, transportation) play a crucial role in the successful reintegration of offenders.

Primary Citation: Wikoff, Linhorst, & Morani (2012)

Participation and immersion in the Preventing Parolee Crime Program (PPCP) – a multimodal treatment protocol – was consistently associated with lower rates of reincarceration and absconding compared with traditional parole.

Primary Citation: Zhang, Roberts, & Callanan (2006)

Reentry programs showing the most promise in reducing recidivism rates include vocational/work programs, drug rehabilitation programs, halfway house programs, and pre-release programs.

Primary Citation: Seiter & Kadela (2003)

Halfway house interventions with supervision geared to level of risk/need can be effective with higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Andrews & Janes (2006)

In general, there is support for the effectiveness of halfway house programs in reducing recidivism rates. However, one should be mindful of reserving these services primarily for moderate to high risk offenders.

Primary Citations: Hamilton & Campbell (2014); Latessa, Lovins, & Smith (2010)

In general, community-based reentry programs tend to yield positive outcomes – particularly when they include housing assistance and aftercare components.

Primary Citation: Wright, Zhang, Farabee, & Braatz (2014)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

The neighborhood context in which parolees return plays an important role in their successful reintegration. In particular, the close proximity of social service providers to offenders appears to be important in attenuating recidivism.

Primary Citation: Hipp, Petersilia, & Turner (2010)

Research indicates that therapeutic communities are effective in attenuating recidivism rates among offenders reentering the community.

Primary Citation: Jensen & Kane (2012)

Many of the needs that are particularly salient to women offenders are not currently addressed in the context of reentry services. It is therefore important to continue developing gender-responsive treatment strategies for this growing population.

Primary Citation: Scroggins & Malley (2010)

Probation and parole intervention decisions (supervision level, supervision conditions, behavior change interventions)

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

Gender-responsive assessment (and treatment) strategies are recommended for female offenders so as to tap into the unique contextual factors surrounding their criminal conduct. In turn, this will serve to improve the prediction of criminal outcomes and the identification of appropriate treatment targets for women.

Primary Citation: Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman (2010)

Ongoing reassessment can help identify progress in key domains reflected in parolees' case plans or, conversely, the presence of new criminogenic needs. Reassessment information can then be used to adjust supervision levels to reflect the current likelihood of recidivism exhibited by an individual.

Primary Citation: Jones, Brown, & Zamble (2010)

Intensive supervision and services are most effective when directed to higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Correctional interventions that are grounded in the principles of risk/need/responsivity produce recidivism reductions in the most cost-effective manner.

Primary Citation: Romani, Morgan, Gross, & McDonald (2012)

Training probation officers to adhere to the principles of RNR can effectively serve to reduce recidivism rates of clients under community supervision. Improved outcomes are evidenced when supervision officers spend the majority of their time (i.e., at least 15 minutes per session) working with offenders on criminogenic needs rather than focusing on conditions that are non-criminogenic, and use appropriate cognitive behavioral techniques (e.g., reinforcement, modeling, etc.).

Primary Citations: Bonta et al. (2011); Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine (2008)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Emphasis should be placed on treatment targets (i.e., criminogenic needs) using a variety of interventions, especially cognitive behavioral programming.

Primary Citations: Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006a); Aos, Miller, & Drake (2006b)

Both maintaining a high level of treatment integrity and adhering to a human service treatment philosophy increase program effectiveness. It is recommended that agencies implement periodic assessments such as the CPAI so as to ensure continued program integrity.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa (2010)

Research indicates a relationship between the integrity with which a correctional program is implemented and recidivism outcomes.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Consistent with research supporting CBT interventions with offenders, Thinking for a Change (TFAC) participation produced significant reductions in recidivism rates among offenders on probation.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios, & Latessa (2009)

Grounded in principles of restorative justice, reparative probation (as implemented in Vermont) is a more effective alternative to standard probation with respect to lowering recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Humphrey, Burford, & Dye (2012)

Reducing caseload sizes results in fewer rearrests and technical violations for probationers and parolees.

Primary Citation: Taxman, Yancey, & Bilanin (2006)

Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders.

Primary Citation: Dowden & Andrews (2004)

The enforcement role of the probation officer needs to be balanced with a helping role that is grounded in cognitive behavioral principles.

Primary Citations: Bonta, Rugge, Scott, Bourgon, & Yessine (2008); Bonta et al. (2011)

Community behavior change (treatment) interventions

Validated risk assessments have been demonstrated to effectively identify risk and criminogenic needs.

Primary Citation: Gendreau, Goggin, & Little (1996)

Commented [MC1]: There is contradictory research here. It depends on what they do with the reduced size.

Identifying and addressing gender-responsive needs at the pretrial stage via structured assessments and interventions may contribute to more successful outcomes for women.

Primary Citation: Gehring & Van Voorhis (2014)

Gender-responsive assessment (and treatment) strategies are recommended for female offenders so as to tap into the unique contextual factors surrounding their criminal conduct. In turn, this will serve to improve the prediction of criminal outcomes and the identification of appropriate treatment targets for women.

Primary Citation: Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman (2010)

Although practitioners typically administer structured risk/need assessments, they rarely link scores to appropriate service needs and supervision decisions.

Primary Citation: Viglione, Rudes, & Taxman (2015)

While most practitioners use validated risk/need assessments, only about 40% actually use assessment results to guide case planning.

Primary Citation: Haas & DeTardo-Bora (2009)

Treatment programming is most effective when targeted to higher risk offenders and their criminogenic needs, and preferably (though not exclusively) be community-based.

Primary Citation: McGuire (2002)

Intensive supervision and services are most effective when directed to higher risk offenders.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Among high risk individuals, recidivism reduction effects do not begin to materialize until 200–250 hours of programming have been administered; moderate risk individuals maximize benefit from programming after approximately 100 hours.

Primary Citations: Center for Effective Public Policy (2014); Makarios, Sperber, & Latessa (2014)

Providing intensive programming to low risk individuals is apt to increase recidivism within this group.

Primary Citation: Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, & Rooney (2000)

Staff who are trained in a formal case management model achieve more positive outcomes (i.e., reduced recidivism) with justice-involved individuals.

Primary Citation: Smith, Schweitzer, Labreque, & Latessa (2012)

Recidivism is more likely reduced when the justice system focuses on criminogenic needs, uses a cognitive behavioral approach, reserves more intensive services for the higher risk offender, and uses aftercare services.

Primary Citation: Andrews (2007)

Correctional interventions that are grounded in the principles of risk/need/responsivity produce recidivism reductions in the most cost-effective manner.

Primary Citation: Romani, Morgan, Gross, & McDonald (2012)

Cognitive behavioral therapy is effective in reducing recidivism by as much as 25 to 50% under certain conditions. Effects increase when the programming dosage is increased, when higher risk justice-involved individuals are targeted, and when the quality of implementation is monitored.

Primary Citation: Lipsey, Landenberger, & Wilson (2007)

Programming should ideally be tailored to individual need profiles.

Primary Citation: Vieira, Skilling, & Peterson-Badali (2009)

Women exposed to a gender-responsive case management model have a significantly lower rate of new arrests compared to women in a control group.

Primary Citation: Robinson, Van Diemen, & Millson (2012)

While sex offenders do present with some unique dynamic risk factors, they are more similar to the general population of justice-involved individuals than they are different, and primary treatment targets for sex offenders parallel those of the general population of justice-involved individuals (e.g., antisocial attitudes, impulsivity, employment instability, antisocial associates, etc.).

Primary Citation: Levenson & Prescott (2014)

According to a recent study, only 7.5% of crimes committed by offenders suffering from mental illness were directly related to symptoms of the illness; fewer than 1 in 5 crimes (18%) were either directly related or mostly related to mental illness.

Primary Citation: Peterson, Skeem, Kennealy, Bray, & Zvonkovic, 2014

The seven dynamic risk factors outlined in the “what works” literature are equally applicable to justice-involved individuals with mental illness as they are to justice-involved individuals without mental illness. For example, antisocial cognition and antisocial personality factors have been identified as strong predictors of crime within the population of justice-involved individuals with mental illness.

Primary Citations: Bonta, Blais, & Wilson (2014); Bonta, Law, & Hanson (1998)

Over 90% of justice-involved individuals have either experienced or witnessed physical or sexual abuse. In addition, approximately 25% of American youths experience some form of extreme adverse event. Critically, there is evidence linking the experience of childhood trauma with antisocial behavior in adolescence and adulthood.

Primary Citations: Anda et al. (2006); Duke, Pettingell, McMorris, & Borowsky (2010); Harlow (1999)

Incorporating elements of trauma-informed care is apt to increase the responsiveness of justice-involved individuals to evidence-based cognitive behavioral programming aimed at reducing more proximal criminogenic needs (e.g., antisocial attitudes, substance abuse)

Primary Citation: Miller & Najavitz (2012)

Evidence-based programs are equally effective regardless of a participant’s ethnicity.

Primary Citation: Landenberger & Lipsey (2005)

Studies with juvenile populations have revealed that matching service providers to clients based on ethnic background decreases externalizing symptoms and treatment attrition, and increases the probability of successful program completion.

Primary Citation: Halliday-Boykins, Schoenwald, & Letourneau (2005)

Both maintaining a high level of treatment integrity and adhering to a human service treatment philosophy increase program effectiveness. It is recommended that agencies implement periodic assessments such as the CPAI so as to ensure continued program integrity.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa (2010)

Research indicates a relationship between the integrity with which a correctional program is implemented and recidivism outcomes.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp & Latessa (2004)

Consistent with research supporting CBT interventions with offenders, Thinking for a Change (TFAC) participation produced significant reductions in recidivism rates among offenders on probation.

Primary Citation: Lowenkamp, Hubbard, Makarios, & Latessa (2009)

Cognitive behavioral programs applied across both institutional and community settings – namely, Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) – effectively reduce recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Tong & Farrington (2006)

Anger management is an effective form of intervention for recidivism reduction, producing moderate effect sizes when compared to untreated groups.

Primary Citation: Del Vecchio & O’Leary (2004)

The effect of employment/vocational programming on recidivism outcomes is equivocal. One meta-analysis found no evidence that this type of programming reduced recidivism over a 2-year follow-up period, while a second meta-analysis reported more favorable results, although 90% of the studies included in the second meta-analysis were methodologically flawed.

Primary Citations: Visser, Winterfield, & Coggeshall (2005); Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie (2000)

Cognitive behavioral therapy, therapeutic communities, and drug courts—rather than 12-step programs such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous—are the most promising substance abuse program options for prisoners, parolees, and probationers. These options result in lower rates of drug use and recidivism compared to non-treated groups.

Primary Citation: Bahr, Masters, & Taylor (2012)

Research has demonstrated the Duluth Model’s negligible success in reducing violent behavior among justice-involved individuals and the superiority of cognitive behavioral models.

Primary Citation: Feder & Wilson (2005)

Statistically, Duluth-based programming have no effect on recidivism rates, while various non-Duluth group-based DV treatments (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy, substance abuse treatment, etc.) show more promising results (i.e., a reduction in domestic violence reoffending of 33%).

Primary Citation: Miller, Drake, & Nafziger (2013)

While the provision of housing services on its own does not reduce recidivism, housing combined with other services (e.g., employment, substance abuse, etc.) has been shown to reduce recidivism by 12%.

Primary Citation: Miller & Ngugi (2009)

Mental health courts (diversion programs) linked to a range of community resources are a promising avenue for the processing of offenders battling mental illness.

Primary Citation: Case, Steadman, Dupuis, & Morris (2009)

The application of structured assessment tools such as the HCR-20 and PCL:SV could potentially be used to assess mentally ill offenders' diversion eligibility, and to place them in community-based treatment, thereby reducing the number of noncompliances and reincarcerations.

Primary Citation: Barber-Rioja, Dewey, Kopelovich, & Kucharski (2012)

Violation response decisions (response level, sanctions, behavior change interventions)

Research supports correctional agencies' adoption of operant behavioral techniques in the management of offenders on community supervision. Specifically, rewards should exceed sanctions in a ratio of 4:1.

Primary Citation: Wodahl, Garland, Culhane, & McCarty (2011)

A model that encompasses both rewards and sanctions is more highly predictive of successful program completion than a reward model or a sanction model alone. The probability of successful program completion is optimized when the reward-to-sanction ratio is 4:1.

Primary Citation: Andrews & Bonta (2010)

Stringent supervision conditions tend to produce more technical violations and more incarceration and do not reduce recidivism by themselves.

Primary Citation: Petersilia & Turner (1993)

Sanctions on their own do not change offender behavior or reduce recidivism. More severe sanctions may increase recidivism.

Primary Citations: Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau (2002); Gendreau & Goggin (1996)

Even graduated sanctions (i.e., incrementally escalating the severity of penalties for noncompliant behavior) can ultimately lead to noncompliance; specifically, individuals may become habituated to punishment such that future sanctions are rendered ineffective at suppressing unwanted behavior.

Primary Citation: Wodahl (2007)

Immediacy, fairness, consistency, and proportionality in responding to misbehavior are important to shaping behavior.

Primary Citation: Taxman, Soule, & Gelb (1999)

For responses to noncompliance (i.e., punishers) to be effective, they must be (1) swift (happen as quickly as possible), (2) certain (be applied each time the undesirable behavior occurs), (3) fair (be perceived as fair and consistent with similar situations), (4) responsive (take into consideration the unique characteristics of the individual), (5) proportional (be no more severe than the behavior warrants), and (6) parsimonious (employ as few interventions and resources as possible).

Primary Citation: Carter (2015)

Confinement is an ineffective sanction for technical violations, and actually can result in increased recidivism rates.

Primary Citation: Drake & Aos (2012)

Attention to staff characteristics and skills is necessary to enhance outcomes with offenders.

Primary Citation: Dowden & Andrews (2004)